



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/657,971	09/08/2000	Nobumasa Suzuki	35.C11969 REI	3511

5514 7590 05/20/2002

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

ALEJANDRO MULERO, LUZ L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1763

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2002

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

MF/XC

Advisory Action	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/657,951	SUZUKI
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Luz L. Alejandro	1763

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 01 May 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

- (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____.

3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.

4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.

6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 1-18 and 26-49.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 19-25 and 50-110.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. Other: _____.


GREGORY MILLS
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the rejection under 35 USC 251 of claims 1-110; and 35 USC 101 of claim 110.

Reissue Applications

This reissue application was filed without the required offer to surrender the original patent or, if the original is lost or inaccessible, an affidavit or declaration to that effect. The original patent, or an affidavit or declaration as to loss or inaccessibility of the original patent, must be received before this reissue application can be allowed.

See 37 CFR 1.178.

A form of a Statement Under 37 CFR 3.73 (b) was attached to the office action mailed 02/28/01, please complete the form and return it with your response as to satisfy with the requirement under 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/01/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding applicant's claim of unexpected results: 1) attorney's statements cannot take the place of evidence in the form of affidavits in the record; 2) the unexpected results are not commensurate in scope with the claims (in this case applicant argues that the increase in slot density generates unexpected results such as higher density plasma, however the slot density increase is not claimed); 3) the embodiments cited by applicants do not demonstrate the claimed unexpected results since both the number of dielectrics and the number of slots in embodiment 5 (applicants invention) were modified from embodiment 1 (prior art), therefore, it is

impossible to attribute the unexpected results specifically to either the number of dielectrics or the number of slots.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Luz L. Alejandro whose telephone number is 703-305-4545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 7:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory L. Mills can be reached on 703-308-1633. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.

LLAM
LLAM
May 19, 2002

GM
GREGORY MILLS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700